

Applicant : Narad, Chuck
Serial No. : 10/748,997
Filed : 12/29/2003
Page : 7

Attorney's Docket No.: 42P8220C12
Intel Docket No.: P8220C12



REMARKS

1. Requested Amendment to the Title

The Examiner requested an amendment to the title that is more descriptive. In the previous office action response, Applicants amended the title from:

ACCESSING TRANSMISSION CONTROL PROTOCOL (TCP) SEGMENTS

to:

REASSEMBLY OF A TRANSMISSION CONTROL PROTOCOL (TCP) DATA
STREAM FROM PAYLOADS OF TCP SEGMENTS OF A BIDIRECTIONAL TCP
CONNECTION

Applicants believe the amended title is a pretty good description and are not sure what the Examiner is looking for. Applicants are amenable to an Examiner's amendment of the title and the Examiner is invited to call the handling attorney, Rob Greenberg, at 978-553-2060.

2. Rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. 101

Applicants have amended claims 65 and 74 as suggested by the Examiner.

3. Rejection of Claims 65-81

The Examiner rejected claims 65-81 as anticipated by Engel et al. (6,115,393). In the previous office action response, Applicants pointed out that Engel did not teach reassembly of a TCP data stream as recited by the amended claims. The Examiner's current office action correctly notes that TCP end-points reassemble received segments based on their sequence number since that is one of the main reason to have sequence numbers in the first place! However, claims 65 and 74 recite reassembly of the pair of data streams flowing in both directions between TCP end-points. For example, an

implementation of claim 65 may be placed in a router carrying TCP/IP packets between two end-points. To continue the Examiner's example regarding reassembly of the pages of "War and Peace", a router in between two end-points generally tries very hard to get the pages of "War and Peace" (packets) further toward their final destination quickly and relies on the end recipient to reshuffle the pages (packets) into the right order. In essence, the router is like a postal worker who does not read the mail, but just tries to get it delivered as quickly as possible. Using the recited invention, the router could reassemble the data stream in both directions for inspection at the router (e.g., finding a virus in a TCP data stream traveling across the Internet) instead of merely forwarding the packets onward as quickly as possible. Engel does not describe such reassembly nor is such reassembly inherent in receiving packets having a sequence number.

While the Applicants' discussed the example of a router to explain the claimed invention, the techniques are not limited in this regard and the Applicant does not rely on this example for patentability. At the same time, Applicants welcome suggested amendments by the Examiner to improve the claims.

Claim 65 and Claim 74 both recite similar limitations regarding reassembly. For at least the reason above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of renumbered claims 65, 74 and their dependent claims.

Applicant : Narad, Chuck
Serial No. : 10/748,997
Filed : 12/29/2003
Page : 9

Attorney's Docket No.: 42P8220C12
Intel Docket No.: P8220C12

4. In the event that any additional information or explanation is required, please call the undersigned attorney at 978-553-2060.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/18/06

Robert A. Greenberg
Reg. No. 44,133
Intel® Americas Attorney

c/o BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
(503) 684-6200

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage in an envelope addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313 on:

January 18, 2005
Date of Deposit
Katherine Jennings
Name of Person Mailing Correspondence
Katherine Jennings 1-18-05
Signature Date